

THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY REPORTER.

UNDER THE SANCTION OF THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

CXXXI. VOL. V.—No. 25.]

LONDON: WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 11TH, 1844.

[PRICE 4d.]

EMIGRATION TO THE BRITISH COLONIES.

TO THE RIGHT HON. SIR ROBERT PEEL, BART., FIRST LORD OF THE
TREASURY, &c., &c., &c.

SIR,—The welfare of the British West India colonies cannot be a matter of indifference to any who were engaged in their emancipation from slavery, and who are anxious that the example set by this country, in securing it, should be followed by all nations holding slaves, throughout the civilized world. None, not directly interested in the colonies, are more disposed, none are more anxious to build up their prosperity, than the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and they are not aware that any public act of theirs, having reference to them, has been inconsistent with this declaration.

But, sir, anxiously desirous as the Committee have been, and still are, to see the emancipated colonies flourish, they could not consent that this should be effected by the abandonment of a single principle of equity or justice—of freedom or humanity. The deliverance of 750,000 human beings from the degradation and sufferings of slavery, cost the British nation too great a struggle, and too large a sacrifice to allow of this. Hence the Anti-Slavery Society have felt it to be their duty to watch the course of colonial legislation—to expose abuses, and denounce acts of oppression when they have occurred—and to lay before her Majesty's Government, and the public at large, such matters as they have deemed of importance to the interests involved, and to the great object they had in view. Among these, no subject has had a larger share of their attention than emigration to the emancipated colonies. They have carefully investigated the grounds on which its alleged necessity has been justified, and patiently weighed the arguments by which it has been attempted to be sustained, and have not been able to discover either the validity of the one, or the soundness of the other; and, viewed in the light of facts and results, they have felt themselves called upon to oppose it by all the means in their power. The Committee, however, would not be misunderstood. They have never opposed emigration to the colonies when it has been perfectly spontaneous on the part of the emigrants, and effected under those guarantees which insured them the free choice of their employments and employers on their arrival. What they have contended against has been the various schemes which have been resorted to, for supplying them with labourers, which, in principle, they believed to be vicious; and, in their consequences, cruel and revolting. Let facts speak. The emigrants at first introduced into Jamaica, Trinidad, and British Guiana, were, for the most part, decoyed into them by unprincipled agents, who, by delusive promises and false reports, induced large numbers of English, Scotch, Irish, Germans, Portuguese, French, Maltese, and others to emigrate, and the result was, that, what with the labour extracted from them under contracts, the effects of the climate, and disappointment, arising from inadequate wages, insufficient shelter, want of medical care, and general neglect, most of them sank into a premature grave. Nor was this the only class who suffered. The emigrants from the older West India colonies, who were induced to enter into contracts, to labour in British Guiana and Trinidad, became the victims of the same merciless system, and those who survived the period of their indentures, with few exceptions, returned to their homes with the sad tale of the friends they had lost and of the sufferings and privations they had endured. And the same may be said of the Coolies who were imported into Mauritius and British Guiana. These people had been trepanned into contracts for labour of which they knew nothing—kept in confinement until they were shipped on board vessels prepared to receive them—forced under hatches previous to departure to prevent escape—improperly treated during their passage, which frequently led to death from disease or suicide, and on arrival subjected to the hard discipline of the plantations, with the usual results,—a vast mortality on the number imported.

According to official returns it appears that between the 1st August, 1834, and the 15th April, 1843, the number of immigrants introduced into Jamaica was 5,749, exclusive of 1,386 liberated Africans, in all 7,135; into British Guiana, 19,818, exclusive of 1,593 liberated Africans; in all 21,411; and into Trinidad 8,518, exclusive of liberated Africans 829; in all 9,247. These returns cannot, however, be wholly depended upon. The discrepancies between the returns laid before Parliament in 1843 and 1844 are great. The probability is that a much larger number of emigrants have been introduced into these colonies than appears on the face of these documents. It is computed that upwards of 40,000 Indian labourers were introduced into Mauritius between the years 1834 and 1839, when the further export of these people was forbidden; and subsequently to that period, from 1840 to 1842, 1667 Chinese, Malagassays, and natives of the Comoro islands, was imported. Added to these, the imports during the year 1843, according to an official return, amounted to upwards of 35,000, and the importation was then going rapidly on;

so that, it is believed, that since the restriction on the export of Coolies has been taken off, from 40,000 to 50,000 additional labourers have been introduced into that colony. It thus appears that Jamaica has added to her population by emigration 7,135; British Guiana, 21,411; Trinidad, 9,247, and Mauritius, say 86,667, since the year 1834—or nearly 125,000 in all!

The Committee regret that from the very defective nature of the returns laid before Parliament, they are unable to state with any degree of accuracy the mortality which has occurred in connection with the introduction of this vast body of labourers into the emancipated colonies. They are convinced, however, that it has been frightful. As to the Europeans, it is admitted that a large portion died very soon after their arrival in the colonies, so that that species of immigration has been entirely abandoned. And as to the Coolies, a document laid before Parliament in 1840, states, that out of 25,000 who had been introduced into Mauritius, within a period of four years, 7,000 had died; and that the mortality at Port Louis was estimated at from 8 to 9 per cent. per annum. Of the Coolies shipped from Calcutta for British Guiana, 453 in number, 165 died either during the passage thither, or in the colony during the period of their indentures; and of the 236 who returned to India in 1843, after five years' service, 20 per cent. died on their voyage, so that not more than 190 reached their destination alive! The Committee feel this to be a melancholy subject, and conceive that grave responsibility must rest somewhere. In bringing it before you, sir, they would cherish the hope that effectual means will be adopted by the Government for ascertaining as far, and as accurately as possible, the real number of immigrants brought into the British colonies, whether by private individuals, or by means of the colonial funds; the manner in which they were disposed of on arrival, the mortality which has occurred, and what number of the whole thus introduced are now actually engaged in agricultural pursuits.

There is yet another point deserving the searching investigation of Government, viz., the proportion the sexes introduced into the colonies have borne to each other. No official return gives the information required on this important point, but the following facts will give some idea of the extent of the disparity. According to a return made in 1840, out of 19,050 Coolies imported into Mauritius, only 205 were women; and by another return presented this year, out of 30,638 immigrants, only 3,359 were women. In the first case, there was scarcely more than one woman to one hundred men, and in the latter the proportion is about ten women to one hundred men. Of the Coolies introduced into British Guiana, only twelve were women. In whatever point of view the Committee regards this subject, it is full of importance. It affects the moral and social welfare of the immigrants themselves; it deeply affects the interests of the families they leave behind them; and it equally affects the social happiness and moral elevation of the people among whom they are necessarily thrown. The Committee would fain hope that a subject of such vast importance as this may not be overlooked by her Majesty's Government, but that they will feel it to be their duty to interpose their authority to prevent the continuance of so great an evil as that which the disproportion of the sexes presents, and which every Christian philanthropist must deplore.

The Committee need scarcely refer your attention, sir, to the fact that the evils connected with emigration into the British colonies, under contracts for labour, were found to be so great, as to require an order in Council to be issued in 1838, prohibiting all such contracts in future, unless expressly made in them, and under the surveillance of the stipendiary Magistracy; and, in 1839, in consequence of the evils connected with the Coolie trade having grown beyond the power either of regulation or repression, the Government of India enacted a prohibitory law against its continuance, which received the full sanction of the home Government.

It may be said that, fully alive to the enormous abuses which characterised the first schemes of colonial immigration, the present Government have remedied them by causing the enactment of salutary laws, and by issuing a code of instructions calculated to prevent the recurrence of such abuses in future; that now there can be no prison depôts for kidnapped Coolies—no hurrying them on board without due inspection—no putting them under hatches for safe keeping—no shipping them in numbers disproportionate to the space necessary for their accommodation, or the food and water necessary for their sustenance: in short, that they can no longer be brought, under fraudulent contract, to labour for years on scanty wages and meagre fare, and compelled to perform the hardest agricultural labour, at the discretion of their masters, or be neglected when sick, and left without the protection of an independent, impartial, and efficient Magistracy. The Committee readily admit that the cure of abuses has been the design of the Government in the regulations which they have promulgated, and it is not impossible that, had they been worked in England, instead of India and the colonies, they would have prevented, at least, the more glaring abuses and

atrocities, of which there has been such just cause for complaint. But such, unhappily, has not been the case: in fact, the Royal Order in Council, of 1838, regulating contracts, has already been infringed upon. It is now understood that Trinidad has passed an Ordinance, legalizing contracts made out of the colonies, for periods not exceeding twelve months, in contemplation of a large influx of immigrants from Africa and Asia; and that it has been allowed by the Government. Such contracts, made by Africans, Chinese, and Coolies, in ignorance of the real scenes of their labour, of the nature and amount of work they will have to perform, and of the relative value of money, must be injurious to them. Moreover, the contracts will be made in the interests of the employers by their agents; and made, too, for the express purpose of reducing the rate of wages now paid to the Creole labourer. It is an admitted fact, that this is the grand object the Planters have in view in securing the active co-operation of the Government in their emigration schemes. Now it is quite clear, that if Trinidad be permitted to introduce labourers under contracts made out of the colony, no valid objection can be raised to Jamaica and British Guiana following the example; and thus the first and best guarantee, that the labourer shall, at all events, be free on his arrival in the British colonies, is null and void.

With respect to the protective regulations, so much insisted on by the Government, the Committee regret to say, that they have been evaded and violated in a multitude of instances. In procuring Indian emigrants, no conscientious or humane European will be employed; that part of the business is, therefore, as formerly, in the hands of native brokers, who send out their duffadars, or crimps, in all directions, and by means of promises never intended to be realized, decoy them into engagements from which they are not released when once placed on board the emigrant vessels, and where, for the first time, in most cases, they learn their true destination, and discover the shameful deceits which have been practised upon them. To prevent escape, they are placed under the strictest watch; but, notwithstanding the vigilance of their keepers, they, not unfrequently, in desperation, throw themselves overboard, in the hope of reaching shore, or of dying, rather than pursue their voyage to distant lands.

As to the families of those who are thus removed, they are usually left in a most deplorable state, without resources, and generally, without the means of procuring them; the consequence of which is extreme poverty and wretchedness, and not unfrequently starvation and death.

On reaching Mauritius, the emigrants are not landed agreeably to the regulations in force, but kept on board until they are drafted off to such estates, or persons, as will take them. No liberty of choice is allowed them, either as it respects employments or employers. The Inspector or Protector of immigrants appears simply in the light of a registrar, who has no duty to perform, but to pass them to the parties selecting them. It may not be known to you, Sir, that in addition to the 7*l.* sterling allowed by the local government of Mauritius, for each Coolie introduced, the planter pays the importer for the liberty of selection, ten dollars per head. To dignify this mode of dealing with the Indian labourers by the name of free immigration, would be absurd. But this is the way in which one part of her Majesty's subjects are permitted to be dealt with by another.

But if it could be made to appear to the Committee, that the emigration laws of the colonies were perfectly unexceptionable, and the regulations intended to control it through its various stages were rigidly enforced, they would still feel bound to object to it as it is now intended to be carried on.

The Committee feel it to be their duty respectfully but decidedly to protest against the introduction of masses of adult labourers into the emancipated colonies, as likely to prove morally injurious to the enfranchised negroes and their families, as well as to the immigrants themselves. In Mauritius, an unbounded licentiousness prevails, frequently manifesting itself in forms the most loathsome, revolting, and unnatural; and the same will undoubtedly be the case in Jamaica, Trinidad, and British Guiana, should they be afflicted with the presence of a large influx of idolatrous and sensual Asiatics. Deeply do the Committee regret, that her Majesty's Government should have entertained for an instant the idea of peopling the colonies with adult male labourers, or, what is equivalent to it, allow the repeal of such parts of the immigration laws as were in force in the colonies, which required either that two-thirds, or one-half of the labourers to be introduced should be of the female sex.

The Committee, feeling this to be a point of vital importance, venture to press it upon your most serious attention. They cannot be persuaded, that the real prosperity of the colonies can ever be secured by the moral degradation of the people. But the Committee are persuaded, that economically as well as morally, the introduction of masses of male labourers into the colonies is open to the most serious objections. In addition to the original cost of introduction, the survivors of the immigrants are to be returned to their native homes at the end of five years' service, at the expense of the colonies. Suppose 1,500,000*l.* be expended on the introduction of 100,000 emigrants into Jamaica, Trinidad, and British Guiana, it will require 1,000,000*l.* more to restore those who survive the period of service, and desire to return home, to the original ports of shipment. This large sum is independent of the interest accruing thereon, supposing it to be raised by loans. Nor is this all: as the labourers die off, or are restored to their homes, they must be replaced by new importations, if it be intended to keep up

the cultivation, and thus what may be termed a permanent charge on the colonial funds will be perpetuated.

The Committee regret to observe that the expenses connected with this vast scheme of immigration are to be borne, not by the resources of those intended to be benefited thereby, but by funds raised from additional colonial taxation. There is injustice in this. It might surely be sufficient that the colonists, composed mostly of labourers, bore the heavy expenditure of the general and local government, without being made responsible, for an indefinite number of years to come, for the supply of transient labourers to cultivate the estates of non-resident, as well as resident proprietors, or to pay off the debts due to mortgagees and merchants, whose interests are not strictly identified with those of the inhabitants at large.

It is understood that, in addition to the large sums already expended out of the public purse for immigration, Jamaica, Trinidad, and British Guiana, are authorized to enact laws for raising loans to the extent of 1,500,000*l.*, to be devoted hereafter to the same object. These loans are to be repaid with the interest thereon, out of the public taxes; and with the view of giving greater sanction to this expenditure, and to facilitate operations in the money market, it is said Government will undertake to guarantee the loans raised by obtaining the sanction of the Imperial Legislature thereto. Now, when it is the avowed design of these loans to introduce masses of labourers to compel a reduction in the current rate of wages, already low enough, paid to the native labouring population, and to burden them, at the same time, with additional taxation, the Committee conceive there is inhumanity as well as injustice in the measure, and that it ought not to be sanctioned by the Government. The Committee, therefore, sincerely hope that no such measure will be proposed to Parliament, involving as it does the material and moral interests of the emancipated classes, whose welfare, as well as that of their employers, should be sought in every legislative act.

In the remarks which the Committee have hitherto submitted to you, Sir, they have taken exception principally to the importation into the emancipated colonies, of Asiatics. They feel bound, however, to state that they feel equal repugnance to the introduction of Africans; and they must add, still greater repugnance in view of the regulations proposed. Up to a recent period, the African torn from his native home, by the infamous slave-dealer, found an asylum within the British settlement at Sierra Leone. It is to be an asylum no longer, except, so far as he is concerned, upon impossible conditions. After he has been liberated by a sentence of the Court of Mixed Commission, he is to be turned adrift, homeless and friendless. Clothed he is to be, for public decency would be outraged if he were sent on shore naked, as taken in the slaver. He is not, however, to be allowed food or shelter, the governor having received peremptory orders to withdraw the usual rations and superintendence until the unfortunate being could be properly disposed of. The only alternative left him is starvation or transportation to some one of the West India colonies. How far this is consonant with British humanity, or with free emigration, it is not difficult to decide, but the Committee earnestly hope that it will never be allowed to be carried into effect.

In addition to the large expenditure of the public money which the proposed scheme of immigration will involve—the deep injury it will inflict on the emancipated classes who will have to bear the weight of competition as well as the burden of increased taxation—the wrongs that will be inflicted on the emigrants, and the families they may leave behind them, and the fearful immorality and mortality which will follow in its train, the Committee conceive two consequences of material importance are likely to result from it. The first is—that the planters, instead of depending on their own industry, skill, and enterprise, and originating and carrying into effect improved and economical modes of cultivating their lands, will depend on the constant influx of manual labour, which they are persuaded will be found to deceive their expectations, whilst it retards improvement. Two things the colonies want to insure their prosperity—a resident proprietary, and capital to carry on with vigour the cultivation of their estates. Were there a resident proprietary, capital would be soon found, and the means of economizing labour and increasing its efficiency, would be found with it. It is by this means the pressure resulting from an antecedent vicious and costly system of management may be best remedied, and the difficulties alleged to exist may be most effectually surmounted. The second consequence is—that foreign powers, having slave colonies or territories, will copy the example set them by this country, and under the name of free emigration, carry on an extensive slave-trade. It is a well-known fact, that, with the exception of the United States, every slave-holding power complains of the want of labour. Without the importation of slaves to a very large extent every year, neither Brazil nor the Spanish colonies could keep up their cultivation. It is not to be supposed that either Brazil or Spain would be very scrupulous as to the means by which they might obtain free labourers on the coast of Africa, to become, what in fact they would be in their provinces and dependencies, slave labourers. Already Brazil is turning its attention to this subject, and Spain will follow, if she finds herself impeded in carrying on the direct slave-trade. France has already allowed her colony of Bourbon to introduce a body of labourers from Zanzibar. Report says, they were purchased at about five pounds per head, and that, though nominally free, they are really slaves. The Committee do not positively affirm this to be the case. They would hope that it is not so; but it might be true, and yet admit of no redress on the part of this country. The Dutch colony of Surinam, in South America, and the Danish colonies in the West Indies, are similarly circum-

stanced, with respect to labour, with the French colonies; their agricultural population is gradually, and, in some cases, rapidly diminishing. These have each settlements on the Western coast of Africa, whence they might draw immigrants; and in the course pursued by the British Government, they might have both a precedent and a justification for their doings.

On these grounds, Sir Robert, the Committee respectfully make their appeal to you as the head of her Majesty's Government. They feel that the case is a strong one, and as such they submit it to your consideration. To every scheme of immigration into the emancipated colonies, which is not perfectly voluntary and free from beginning to end, which is not carried on either at the cost of the immigrants themselves or at the charge of those introducing them, and which is not regulated by laws in accordance with the Royal Orders in Council relating to contracts and vagabondage, passed in October, 1838, the Committee feel insuperable objections. Should the scheme referred to be brought before Parliament, they are assured that the friends of the anti-slavery cause throughout the country will sustain them in any measures it may be necessary to take in relation thereto; but they sincerely hope that you, sir, will withhold your sanction from the projected measure, which, however it may for a time enrich the few at the expense of the many, must in the end be disastrous to the interests it is intended to uphold.

Apologising for the length to which these details have been drawn by the Committee, and trusting they will be excused for the earnest manner in which they have addressed you,

I have the honour to be,

Sir Robert,

On behalf of the Committee,

Your obedient humble servant,

(Signed)

THOMAS CLARKSON.

27, New Broad-street, Nov. 12, 1844.

MAURITIUS.

THE last arrivals from Mauritius are of a very gloomy description. By both the *Watchman* and the *Cernéen* the island is affirmed to be in circumstances of extreme distress, and impending calamity. The monetary difficulties are thus exhibited by the *Cernéen* :—

Any one acquainted with the present state of affairs in the colony is aware of the fact that the payment of certain debts in silver—that of our labourers' wages, for instance—necessitates exorbitant sacrifices to the distressed and honest debtors; every kind of commercial paper is at a discount; bills on England and France at six months' sight are at 9 and 10 per cent. below par; an extremely deplorable state of things which cannot but get worse and worse unless remedied without delay.

A more general description of trouble is thus given by the *Watchman* :—

What strikes us now at Mauritius? A deficit of a million of dollars on last year; and we are engaged to furnish sixty-seven millions of sugar this year, of which we have already received and spent the price, and we shall hardly make forty millions. The epizootic has ravaged and continues to ravage every quarter of the island; and thus we see the capital we possessed disappearing with the herds which formed part of it, and our hopes of the crop on which we had calculated disappointed for want of animals to gather it. But are not they who did not use bullocks for working their crop exempt from this calamity? No, certainly not. Those who use mules must buy some every year, and now, instead of paying from 150 to 200 dollars, they must pay from 300 to 400 dollars each. He is therefore a loser as well as he who used oxen, and all have thus been unfortunate, and all deserve commiseration. We have been very severe on the agents, and perhaps we shall be so again, but we never have been, and never will be, unjust. They are also indebted: they have contracted engagements which they cannot fulfil, and in the critical situation in which we now are, they will also be ruined without great care. From the planters and agents downwards, every branch of industry is in danger, and a catastrophe is preparing which threatens to overwhelm everything in general ruin. And what is the result of it? What is done to avert this calamity? Here is the impatient creditor, who stamps and raves; here the advocate who listens calmly, and already carries his items to account. A property purchased two years ago at a high price is sold for next to nothing. The first creditors are scarcely paid, with the advocate, who never forgets himself. A father of a family who has been all his life honest and industrious is turned out of doors, and the too harsh creditor finds too late that he has been guilty of a crime by which he has gained nothing. These evils exist, and nothing is done to stop them, even when sales under distress warrants occur on every side. What is to be done? We must have great courage to meet a great danger. The agents and planters must unite, and the situation of the country must be freely discussed. Let those cry shame who will, we speak out boldly:—*general suspension of payment!!!*

The public exchequer seems to be as empty as the private purse; since the governor has found it necessary to pass a Minute of Council, declaring that the money appropriated to immigration is all spent, and that the colony must repay the advances which have been made. His Excellency's Minute concerning the immigration tax is couched in the following terms :—

On submitting to the Council Board the registers of immigration, and the returns of the revenue and expenditure to the 30th ult., it is my painful duty to inform you of the almost entire failure of the immigration tax, and to direct your immediate and serious attention to the means of remedying the deficiency, and meeting the expenses that essential and important object may occasion for the future, as well as of replacing the funds which have already been applied to immigration but that were destined to public works urgently required by the colony.

(Signed)

W. M. GOMM.

We are far from rejoicing at this state of severe suffering and impending ruin; but we cannot help asking,—is this glorious prosperity which has been so confidently anticipated for Mauritius? What strenuous efforts have been made to effect the transportation to her shores of labourers by tens of thousands! And when the scheme was matured, what loud boastings were heard that where labour went capital would follow, and that Mauritius was saved! Alas! she stood upon a giddy precipice, and quickly has she been hurled into the depths of despair. This is, in our judgment, the natural result of the course which has been followed, and a fit retribution for the frenzy and desperation with which it has been pursued. Will the British colonies in the West Indies have the wisdom to take warning from the fate of Mauritius?

Besides the general ruin, the measure which was to be the salvation of the colony has proved the source of many evils. Look for example at the state of the *depôt* for newly arrived immigrants at St. Louis, thus depicted by the *Cernéen* :—

It becomes urgently necessary to take some measures calculated to put an end to the serious disorders which occur at present at the *depôt*. Pitched battles are fought to obtain labourers, and such of the latter as have already come to an agreement change their minds in a moment under the influence of the promises or threats of the sirdars. This morning, numerous and very serious blows were exchanged between the new comers and their fellow-countrymen, the agents of the planters, and we should not be surprised to hear that disagreeable consequences had accrued to the latter therefrom. Is this the liberty it was intended to insure to the immigrants? Nothing has less the appearance of free competition than what is now taking place at the *depôt*.

Or if we listen to the *Watchman*, he tells a similar tale :—

The scandalous conduct of some planters in disputing for the Indians at the Bagne is not forgotten. What will be said then to what took place on Thursday? Two hundred men were ready to contract engagements. The yard was crowded at an early hour by persons, some followed by sirdars, pledged to engage for them, others carrying bags of bread. Each one strove to coax the Indians to them; they disputed among themselves; all shame was forgotten; and the Indians may be said to have been carried into the protector's office rather than to have walked in. * * *

We are assured, but we do not give it on our own authority, that one of our merchants actually paid a sirdar 200 dollars to procure him a certain number of hands. We are also told that a sirdar on the last arrival, got over the fence at the Bagne during the night, and thus contrived to secure to himself a numerous band; we understand that this fact came to the ears of the protector, who had the individual arrested.

And with all this frantic eagerness and unblushing knavery to obtain hands, the hands they have are not at work. Thus speaks the *Watchman* :—

How great a proportion of the immigrants in this colony, instead of fulfilling the design of their introduction by labouring in the fields, infest town and country, living a life of idleness and plunder? An efficient police force would restore many thousands of hands to field labour, whose passage was paid with no other view than their employment in that branch, by stringent measures not pronounced only but enforced against vagrancy. Who that has an Indian in his service in town, can believe in the want of labourers, when he sees the numerous gossips which haunt his house from day to day, without occupation or any manifest means of subsistence? This is much more apparent since the expiration of the first year of the new immigrants, and it is this which causes such unlimited demands for hands. * * * Our plantations can never support the thousands of idlers which now live upon their produce, and burden the country with an incubus totally incompatible with a healthy state of things. *Instead of disputing about Indians, let proper measures be proposed for procuring a supply of Africans.*

We have marked in italics the last sentence of the preceding extract, because we think it carries the infatuation of the immigration mania farther than we have ever seen it carried before. Affected but lately with an insatiate craving for Coolies, the Mauritians are already disgusted with them, and cry out for Africans; just as the Coolie experiment there has been deemed by the Government so eminently successful, that 12,500 of them are ordered for the West Indies, because so few Africans can be procured! We should think the sagacity of our Colonial Minister must be somewhat at fault in this business. However, since the indispensable element, money, is wanting, it may be presumed with some confidence that emigration to Mauritius from any quarter is pretty nearly at an end. It is well that such extravagant follies should bring their own cure; and we may hope, perhaps, that the Mauritians will not show themselves less docile than that well-known portion of mankind, who, although they learn by nothing else, do learn by experience.

We cannot dismiss this subject, without extracting from the *Cernéen* an article from the *Friend of India*, exposing the shameful neglect of the Mauritius Government in relation to Coolies returning to India.

A second instance of mortality in a Coolie ship has just been forced on public notice. The ship *Baboo*, which was employed to bring back time-expired Coolies from the Mauritius, lost six men in her way to Madras, and eleven between Madras and Calcutta. She left this port about five months ago with 240 Coolies, which was the full number she was allowed to carry according to the regulations. In her voyage to the Mauritius she lost three, one of whom was a woman who died in child-birth. On her return, she brought 270 adults, besides some children, which was nearly one-third more than she would have been permitted by the rules of this Government to take, and she lost seventeen. In the two instances in which there has been an extraordinary mortality among the Coolies, the vessels have been found to have carried more than the legal complement of Coolie passengers. The inference is inevitable. The Captain states that he had thirty-five days' water on board, at the rate of a gallon a man, but that having been becalmed for ten days, and meeting with the

Nankin, he procured from her a supply of rice and water, which prevented their running short on the voyage. If we have not been misinformed, the commander purchased the water from the *Nankin*, which few captains would be disposed to do before they had put their crew and passengers on short allowances. The captain appears to have behaved throughout the voyage with great liberality, and the Coolies say they were treated with much humanity by him. No additional supply of medicine was taken on board at Mauritius, though some was purchased at Madras. The same medical gentleman who went down with the vessel, returned in her; but this appears to have been the result of accident.

The conduct of the public authorities at the Isle of France, in reference to the return of Coolies to India, presents a painful contrast to the humane solicitude of the public officers in Calcutta; and if we are to regard the utter indifference which the officers of the island have manifested to the health and comfort of the men they send back, as a sample of the mode in which their general duties are performed, the office of Protector of Emigrants must be a farce, and something worse. After their engagements have expired, and the men are no longer likely to be of any service to the island, all concern for their welfare seems to cease. The public functionaries are utterly careless as to the number of human beings embarked on any vessel, and the owners are at liberty to cram them to a degree which has produced a most fearful mortality. The commander appears to be under no necessity of supplying either medicine or medical attendance. All those regulations which have been humanely established in Calcutta for provisioning the Coolies on the voyage, are totally disregarded, and all that the captain is bound to furnish is a pound and a half of rice daily, two pounds of salt fish a week, some salt and wood, and accommodations for cooking. The salt fish has been found in every instance to aggravate, even if it has not occasioned the diseases to which so many have fallen victims; and the men would be far better without, than with it. The Government of India is utterly powerless in these cases of glaring delinquency. The remedy lies with Lord Stanley and the Colonial Office, and we hope the Anti-Slavery Society will beset themselves, and bring the matter without delay under his Lordship's notice.

NOTICES.

THE ANTI-SLAVERY REPORTER is an Evening Paper, published on alternate Wednesdays, and may be had of all News-venders throughout the country. Price 4d., or 8s. 8d. per annum. A few complete volumes are on hand.

Subscriptions and Donations to the Society should be forwarded to the Treasurer, (G. W. Alexander, Esq.,) at the Society's Office, 27, New Broad-street, London.

All Communications for the Editor of the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* must be sent to the Office of the Society, as above.

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

The day of our next publication being Christmas-day, the next number of the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* will be issued on Tuesday, the 24th, instead of Wednesday, the 25th of December.

The Anti-Slavery Reporter.

LONDON, DECEMBER 11, 1844.]

We have inserted to-day, in its entire form, the memorial which, as we mentioned in our last, was presented to Sir Robert Peel, by a deputation of the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, on the 25th of November, on immigration into the British colonies. It will exhibit fully to our readers the view taken by the Committee of the general subject, and we commend it to their attentive perusal. It is due both to our readers and to the Government that we should say, that nothing which transpired in the interview with the Premier has had the effect of changing in any particular the sentiments of the Committee as expressed in the memorial. We are ready to hope that the attitude of the Jamaica Assembly, the excitement in British Guiana, and the ruin brought on themselves by the Mauritian planters, may induce the Government to refrain from any further prosecution of the Immigration scheme.

THE *League* has thought proper to renew its attack on the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, in an article of nearly four columns. We have read this effusion attentively, in order to see if it contained any new matter, or anything otherwise requiring notice; but we find only the old matter raised up, with scarcely any variety of form. With the usual courtesy, this "section of the Anti-Slavery Society" are called "ignorant enthusiasts;" with the usual incorrectness, they are represented as upholders of monopoly, and advocates for the armed suppression of the slave-trade; and with the usual flippancy, they are taunted with a departure from the alleged maxim of their early friends, that free labour is cheaper than slave-labour. It cannot be necessary for us to answer these hackneyed common-places of this tedious controversy at any length. Whether the section of the Anti-Slavery Society referred to be ignorant enthusiasts or not, we, of course shall not presume to decide: but all the world knows that they repudiate the use of arms for the suppression of the slave-trade, and that they advocate the introduction into the British market of all foreign produce, excepting only the produce of slave-labour. As to the alleged maxim that free-labour is cheaper than slave-labour, if it were true (which it is not) in the naked form in which it is presented, it would rather justify than condemn the course which is complained of. Let us try it. Free-labour is cheaper than slave-labour, and

will, consequently, if you can get enough of it to supply the demand for produce, drive slave-labour out of the world. Therefore encourage free-labour! Do what you can to augment its quantity, to enlarge the surface to which it shall be applied, and to foster its remunerative action. Such seems to us to be the legitimate inference from the premises, so far as any regard is had to the question of slavery at all. The ultra-free-traders seem to say, on the other hand, Free-labour is cheaper than slave-labour, but there is not enough of it to supply the existing demand for produce: therefore let the whole mass of slave-labour loose; thus sacrificing the entire anti-slavery question for the sake of augmenting the quantity of produce—an attitude for which, we confess, we are not prepared, and which, we think, they dare not avow. That competition will, as the *League* asserts, be beneficial to British sugar culture, we readily admit, and on this ground we rejoice in the opening of the market to foreign sugar free-grown; but we should still be sorry to purchase this benefit at the cost of encouraging slavery and the slave-trade. Our contemporary, however, is mistaken, we think, in stating that, while the British sugar colonies have been going to decay, the foreign sugar colonies have been "highly prosperous." The latter, it is well known, have suffered at least equally with the former, and are very far from being in a state to exemplify the redeeming power of any element in their condition.

THE Free Church of Scotland has already taken ground on the subject of American slavery, in its official organ, the *North British Review*. In an article on the United States in the November number, avowedly written by a person who has visited them, and currently ascribed to the Rev. Dr. Cunningham, one of the recent deputation thither from the Free Church, the question of slavery comes in for a reference. The writer professes—of course, no one at this time of day dare do otherwise—to have "no desire to palliate the evils of slavery, or to encourage the Americans in apathy and indifference to this great sin and mischief:" we are much mistaken, however, if this article have not this tendency and effect. It is, to a marvellous extent, soothing and apologetic. A noble occasion was presented to the writer for augmenting the force of public sentiment already brought to bear on the slave-holders of the Union, and for placing so large and important a body as the Free Church in active co-operation with the friends of human liberty and happiness throughout the world. But this opportunity, we regret to say, has been entirely lost. Instead of a well-sustained and uncompromising protest against "the great sin and mischief" of American slavery, we have—who would have believed it?—an attack upon American abolitionists. Hear the reviewer's words:—"Those who have assumed to themselves, in the United States, the name of Abolitionists, and who, while they have done much good, by exposing the evils of slavery, have also, we fear, done much harm to a good cause by their injudicious and extravagant views and measures, have succeeded to a large extent in propagating in this country the impression, that in America all men are either Abolitionists in their sense, adopting their views and concurring in their measures, or else approvers and defenders of slavery. This representation is unfair and injurious." Of course it is, and the American Abolitionists never made it. What they have said, and all they have said, is, that those who disapprove of slavery and take no active part against it, are practically its strongest supporters. And this is undoubtedly true. But the Abolitionists (in whose assuming a name so accordant with their object we really see nothing so very atrocious,) have, as asserted by this writer, broached injudicious views, and proposed extravagant measures, and have thus done much harm to a good cause. Whether this be the case or not, we venture to affirm that no member of the Free Church deputation is able to assert it. No portion of that deputation came into contact with any parties from whom a just acquaintance with the views and measures of the Abolitionists could be gathered. The great body of the Presbyterians being southern and pro-slavery men, it behoved the deputation, having before their eyes the importance of the pecuniary issue, to eschew the company of the Abolitionists altogether; and they did so accordingly. Under these circumstances, the writer before us can do nothing but repeat the current representations of the slave-holders themselves: and this is exactly what he has done. To accuse the Abolitionists of doing much harm to a good cause by injudicious and extravagant views and measures, is of heathen origin, but has become the established habit of the South, the standing misrepresentation by which the slave-holders endeavour to enfeeble the hands of the Abolitionists, and to alienate those who should be their friends. To propagate this falsehood—for it is strictly such—is to do all that the upholders of slavery can desire, and to turn the rising influence of the Free Church, which might have been so valuable to the cause of human freedom and happiness, into a grievous impediment and hindrance to its progress. It is painful to think that men, but for whose clear heads and noble hearts, but for whose simplicity of principle, energy of action, and constancy in sacrifices, there would have been no abolition cause in America at all, should be thus inconsiderately libelled in a publication representing a body from which the cause of human liberty, in every form, might have expected so important an aid.

If we are dissatisfied with the stand which has been taken on the subject of slavery by the principal organ of the Free Church, we are in some respects still more grieved by the conduct of a man who must always be regarded as one of its chief ornaments. We mean the Rev. Dr. Chalmers, who, according to the *Presbyterian*, Ame-

ican paper, has written the following letter to the Rev. Dr. Smyth, of Charleston, South Carolina.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I do not need to assure you how little I sympathize with those who, because slavery happens to prevail in the Southern States of America, would unchristianize that whole region, and who even carry their extravagance so far as to affirm that, so long as it subsists, no fellowship or interchange of good offices should take place with its churches or its ministers."

"As a friend to the universal virtue and liberty of mankind, I rejoice in the prospect of those days when slavery shall be banished from the face of the earth; but most assuredly the wholesale system of excommunication contended for by some is not the way to hasten forward this blessed consummation."

"Few things would afford me greater satisfaction than to hear of a commencement in your country of that process by which the labour of freemen might be substituted for that of slaves. As I mentioned to you in conversation, I was exceedingly struck, so far back as twenty-five years ago, by a description of such a process in Humboldt's Travels through South America. This was long anterior to the abolition of slavery in the British colonies; and such was the confidence I then felt in its efficacy that I ventured to draw out a sketch of the Spanish plan, which if adopted at the time, might have insured a far safer and even earlier emancipation than took place afterwards. You will find my account of it in the 12th volume of my works, from page 395 and onward. I have not been able to engage in any sort of public business since I had the pleasure of meeting with you, but I observed that in our Assembly's commission of a few weeks back the subject of American slavery was entertained. I do hope that the resolutions which they have adopted will prove satisfactory."

"I feel it a great acquisition that I have made your acquaintance. We owe you much, and I trust the ministers of the Free Church of Scotland will retain a grateful sense of your able and disinterested services. Do believe me, my dear Sir, yours, most respectfully and truly,
"Edinburgh, Sept. 25th, 1844."

"THOS. CHALMERS."

That Dr. Chalmers intended this letter for publication does not appear, nor do we think it probable. On whatever ground it has been made public, however, it is now matter of fair and necessary animadversion. We should have been happy if this eminent divine had felt it his duty to employ his extensive influence on behalf of the American slave, and in aid of the great cause of human freedom. But it appears that we are not to have this gratification. Dr. Chalmers, although, of course, he rejoices (who does not?) "in the prospect of those days when slavery shall be banished from the face of the earth," is not a friend to its immediate abolition. He would like to see the commencement, he says, of a "process by which the labour of free men might be substituted for that of slaves;" nothing more. This, he tells us, was his opinion twenty-five years ago, and he has made no advance since that period. But he does not like what is going on in America, where he thinks that the Abolitionists contend for a "wholesale style of excommunication;" that, "because slavery happens to prevail in the Southern States," they "would unchristianize that whole region;" and that they "even carry their extravagance so far as to affirm that, so long as it exists, no fellowship or interchange of good offices should take place with its churches or its ministers." With respect to gradual or immediate abolition, Dr. Chalmers is quite entitled, of course, to his own opinion; nor do we know that any one can be justly surprised at its being what it is, since he never took any active part in the efforts for the termination of slavery in the British colonies. But we think he should have made himself better acquainted with the facts of the case as relating to American slavery and abolitionists, before he ventured to express his views respecting them in any way likely to bring them before the public. If we did not know that the use of the phrase is an habitual Chalmersism, we should say that his speaking of slavery as *happening* to exist in the United States betrayed a levity altogether unsuited to the subject. Nothing can be more calculated to aid the oblivion of moral distinctions, than to speak of what is undoubtedly both willing and wilful in terms which liken it to a physical effect. A tempest or a plague might "happen to prevail;" but the prevalence of slavery is a widely different matter. This arises from the tenacious resolution of 250,000 holders of slaves, and involves the daily perpetration of innumerable acts of violence, cruelty, and wrong. Dr. Chalmers certainly does not know what American slavery is. And as little does he know the American Abolitionists. Let one of themselves be heard on this matter.

"The Abolitionists of the United States, Dr. Chalmers intimates, would unchristianize the whole South because slavery 'happens' to prevail there. Where did he learn this? Not from any anti-slavery publication or anti-slavery acts. He goes on to assert that we affirm, that, so long as it (slavery) subsists, no fellowship or interchange of good offices should take place with its churches (the Southern region) or its ministers. This also is not founded in fact. We do say that no intercourse should prevail between Northern Christians and slave-holding preachers or laymen that implies approbation of their conduct, or a recognition of their Christian character. But refusing to fellowship a man as a Christian does not necessarily imply that we pronounce that he is not a Christian. Has Dr. Chalmers noticed this distinction? If a professor of religion is guilty of a disgraceful practice, he should not be recognised as a Christian until he has repented, and exhibited the evidences of it. Is it not correct that we should say to a minister of the gospel, or a layman, who holds slaves, who buys and sells his fellow men, we will not recognise you as a Christian while you do thus? If this be contrary to Christian charity, to the gospel of the blessed Saviour, and it can be made so to appear, we shall be glad to be instructed in the matter by expounders of Christianity on your side the water. But if we are right, let not English or Scotch doctors of divinity assail us, and tell Southern despots that we do not understand the religion of Christ."

The whole sentence is, in a word, characterised by a tone of exaggeration not unnatural to the fervid genius of the writer, but amounting to grave inaccuracy and untruth in relation to those against whom it is directed. It is to us a matter of sincere regret that Dr. Chalmers does not sympathize with the noble-minded men who have led on the cause of Abolition in America, and still sustain it there; but we are more especially sorry that he should have placed himself in opposition to them, and have done what has a tendency to obstruct the success of those powerful appeals to the conscience, under which many slave-holders, and slave-holding ministers, have begun to quail. After all the trouble which has been taken to arouse these slumbering consciences, it is sad to have an opiate administered to them by such a hand. In the tenor of his letter, Dr. Chalmers is certainly not the respondent of any considerable section of the British public, with whom his once oracular standing no longer remains; and we hope, not of any large portion of the Free Church itself. We trust that other men in that communion, and men not less distinguished than Dr. Cunningham and Dr. Chalmers themselves, will shortly speak on this important subject; and that the Free Church will yet be rescued from the dishonour of bolstering up a system of enormous cruelty and wrong, and of prolonging a conflict which cannot be allowed to have any other issue than success. Dr. Willis, of Glasgow, has made an excellent beginning, and we trust other good men and true will follow his example.

HAD not an unusual press of matter prevented us, we should have inserted to-day an extended account of the meeting of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, in relation to the proceedings of the Free Church of Scotland. The commission appointed by that body has, it appears, prepared a report on American slavery, dealing with the subject in a manner far from satisfactory, and the Committee of the Glasgow Emancipation Society convened a public meeting in consequence. It appears to have been a most numerous, respectable, and animated meeting; and we have read the proceedings, especially the speeches of Dr. Ritchie and Mr. Wright, with great pleasure. We have inserted the two principal resolutions at length, and will find room hereafter, if we can, for the memorial to Christian ministers.

CONSIDERABLE sensation has been produced, with exultation and perplexity according to the standing of different parties, by the arrival at Liverpool of two small parcels (the first was only eleven barrels) of sugar from Venezuela, a state on the continent of South America in which the remnants of slavery exist. The Custom-house having referred to the Government, and the Government to the law officers of the Crown, their opinion was given that, as the treaty between this country and Venezuela contained what is technically known as the most favoured nation clause, the sugar could not be refused admission at the lower duty. From an order in council which has been subsequently issued, it appears that the government of Venezuela has made application to the British government for the admission of sugar from that country at the reduced duty, by virtue of this clause in the treaty.

Our files of Mauritius papers have come to hand, and the intelligence they contain is very important. We have dealt with it in a separate article.

WE insert in another column an interesting letter from our correspondent at Algiers, on the reply of Marshal Bugeaud to the *Institut d'Afrique*.

WE have inserted an article of news from Madrid, intimating the probability of a law being passed against the slave-trade, and referring to O'Donnell's proclamation in Cuba about the confiscation of slave-vessels. We notice the article here only to say that we attach not the slightest importance to movements of this sort. Even if such a law can be passed, it cannot be executed. These are mere diplomatic amusements, which will leave the slave-trade just where it is.

THE editor of the *Colonial Gazette* has favoured us with several notices since our last. He is angry with Lord Stanley for having communicated to the Deputation of the Anti-Slavery Committee the Queen's disallowance of the second set of Guiana ordinances; he entirely mistakes the body of West India cultivators whom we indicated as not sympathizing in the immigration mania; and he misrepresents our language in relation to the burning estates of British Guiana. He will have it, by an absolute perversion of our words, that we have "deliberately published a vindication of incendiarism;" in addition to which he gravely accuses us of the still more aggravated crime of blasphemy. We are sure we must have done something very useful to have provoked so much bile. There is one point, however, in which, it seems, we have misrepresented him. We imputed to him—so he thinks—"an effort to detach the missionaries from the conflict" in British Guiana. But he declares he has not adventured on "so hopeless a task." He is only entreating the friends of the London Missionary Society "to withhold their support from that body until it ceases to support them;" but he does not do this "with any view of detaching them from the conflict," not at all. We hope and believe, however, that he will find this quite as hopeless a task as the other.

UNITED STATES—THE LIBERTY PARTY.

THE papers from the United States refer to little else than the presidential election, and the violent party squabbles to which it has given rise. In this election, the Abolitionists, under the name of the Liberty party, have exerted a sensible influence, and have thus come in for a share of that virulent abuse which defeated partisans invariably scatter with a liberal hand. We shall take the opportunity, therefore, of presenting to our readers a slight sketch of the object and present position of this body.

The Liberty party is composed of the great body of the Abolitionists in the United States—men of high principle, of dauntless courage, and ceaseless activity. They have organized themselves into a political body, for the purpose of accomplishing by means of political action the complete overthrow of slavery in their beloved, though guilty country. They are men who love freedom more than party, and hence have resolved to sacrifice their predilections as Democrats or Whigs on the altar of humanity and freedom; conceiving that the first great duty of every American citizen is to make the principles of the Declaration of Independence, of which they so proudly boast, a reality, and to bring the institutions of the entire Union into harmony with the sublime declaration, that, "All men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." It must not, however, be supposed that they are indifferent to moral suasion and religious appeal. Being mostly religious men, and influenced by religious motives, they fail not to impress upon their fellow-citizens, not only the unimaginable wrongs which are inflicted on nearly three millions of their fellow-men by the existence of slavery, but the deep guilt which it entails upon their country in the sight of God. It is the sinfulness of slavery, not less than its repugnance to the free institutions of their country, and the degradation and wretchedness it inflicts on its helpless victims, which nerves them to the mighty conflict in which they are engaged. The Liberty party were a small band when they first commenced their operations, nevertheless, they commenced boldly; they had a great object in view, and they aimed high. Feeble as they were, they announced for President of the United States a man whose name and fame are known on both sides the Atlantic, the Hon. James G. Birney; and for Vice-President, a man deservedly dear and respected by his coadjutors in the Abolition cause, Thomas Earle. At the close of the first year of their organization, they could muster about 7,000 votes. The ability with which they advocated their cause, the singleness of purpose which they manifested in all their public acts, combined with the importance of the movement itself, drew a multitude of Abolitionists who had stood aloof in the first instance, or were apprehensive of the policy of a political organization, to their ranks, and in the second or third year of their existence they had multiplied tenfold—the seven thousand had become seventy thousand, and this year they have cast probably from ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY TO ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND free and independent votes for the men whom they have wisely selected to represent them in the highest positions of the Government.

For some time, the great political parties of the United States affected to treat the men engaged in this movement with silent contempt; but now that their numbers, their principles, their unity of action, are discovered, they are allowed to take rank as the Liberty party, and it is easy to see that the balance of power will soon be in their hands. The Whigs, whose champion and candidate is the renowned Henry Clay, of Kentucky, courted them; but they rejected him because he is a great slaveholder, and adds to the detestable crime of holding his fellow-men in bondage the reputation of being a notorious duellist and gambler. The Democrats have been equally solicitous of winning them over to the support of their Candidate James K. Polk, of Tennessee; but they rejected him with equal abhorrence as a slaveholder, and the great advocate for the annexation of Texas to the Union.

In all the Free States, from the borders of the Atlantic to the far west, the Liberty party has its ramifications; its chief seat, however, being at present in Massachusetts. But its operations and its advocates are not confined to the Free States. Already a Liberty party is formed in Western Virginia, and is actively engaged in sending forth able and persuasive appeals to the inhabitants of the Old Dominion, in favour of J. G. Birney for the Presidency. In Kentucky, where the eloquent Cassius M. Clay, nephew of the expectant President, is pouring forth denunciations against slavery, as alike subversive of Christianity and the free institutions of his country, we are assured a Liberty party will be formed, as soon as the heat of the present election has subsided. Quiet, but well-considered steps are now being taken to advance the same cause in Eastern Tennessee; and it is believed in the western part of North Carolina. Missouri will soon be agitated with the same subject. In Delaware an Anti-Slavery Convention has been just held, demanding of the Legislature of that State the abolition of slavery at its next session; and in Maryland, the question of slavery is rapidly approaching a crisis. Nor need we wonder at this. In the slave states, the number of slaveholders does not exceed 250,000, whilst the non-slaveholders are at least 750,000, whose interests are deeply compromised, as working-men and citizens, by the existence of slavery. Such are the position and prospects of the Liberty party. May they advance with accelerated speed in their noble career, and be preserved from false friends within their camp, as well as open foes without!

Since writing the above, we have seen with regret an attack on Mr. Birney and the Liberty party, by a correspondent of the *Patriot*. We cannot better reply to it, perhaps, than by inserting the following extract of a letter addressed by Mr. Seoble to the editor of that journal.

With respect to "the main body of the Abolitionists" themselves, whom your correspondent so unjustly maligns, I may mention the honoured names of Tappan, Leavitt, Weld, Phelps, Goodell, Stanton, Gerrit Smith, Whittier, and Wright, among a host of others, by whose liberal munificence, great abilities, and indomitable courage, the anti-slavery cause has been, and is now, chiefly upheld. To suppose for one instant that these men have proved recreant to the cause for which many of them have perilled their lives, and all of them their reputation, though not their character, is impossible, independently of any evidence to the fact. Your correspondent says, that "Birney persuaded his adherents to vote for Polk, because he is so great a booby that he cannot lead his partisans—and to support the annexation of Texas, because the expansion of our internal traffic in slaves will abolish slavery. By which incredible folly," he adds, "the Abolitionists alone, in the States of New York and Pennsylvania, gave more votes for Polk than would have elected patriotism, philanthropy, and piety, to the two first offices of the Union; whereas, by the treachery of Abolitionists in clamouring for the plunder and annexation of Texas, *per fas aut nefas*, they have cursed the world with perjury, Popery, slavery, and irreligion, as the *primum mobile* of our national policy during the next four years." I deny emphatically every word of this audacious libel, and charge upon its author the utterance of a disgraceful falsehood. The whole policy of the main body of the Abolitionists during the last three years, has been to organise, upon purely anti-slavery principles, a politico-religious party, whose single object it should be to return to the State Legislatures, to the House of Representatives, and to the Senate, as well as to the Presidential and Gubernatorial chairs of the Union, men of tried anti-slavery principles and high character, irrespective of party predilections or antipathies. Of the Liberty party—for so they are designated—it may be truly said they have sacrificed their political opinions, both as Whigs and Democrats, on the altar of humanity and freedom; and, as ministering priests, they are resolved to remain by that altar, until its fires shall have utterly consumed slavery out of the land.

During the late almost unexampled struggle between the great political parties for ascendancy, they have steadily kept aloof from both; but, as their chief danger lay with the Whigs, they being for the most part attached by conviction and sympathy to that body, they felt it to be their duty to lay bare the hollow pretensions of Henry Clay to the suffrages of a liberty-loving, humane, and religious people. There was not much danger that any of their friends, at least in New England, would vote for Polk; it became, therefore, necessary, that they should warn them not to vote for Clay. Is Polk a slaveholder? so is Clay. Is Polk opposed to emancipation? so is Clay, "whether it be immediate, gradual, or remote." Is Polk for the annexation of Texas? so is Clay, whenever it can be done securely. Moreover, Henry Clay is a duellist and gambler, and yet he is the god of your correspondent's idolatry! Against this man, and against Polk too, the Abolitionists set up J. G. Birney, a patriot, a statesman, an Abolitionist, and a Christian; and for him the Liberty party have given their votes.

VENEZUELA—SLAVERY AND THE SLAVE-TRADE.

As a good deal of ignorance and misapprehension appears to prevail in relation to slavery and the slave-trade in the republic of Venezuela, the following particulars, drawn from official documents, will probably be acceptable and useful to our readers.

On the 14th August, 1810, the Supreme Junta of Caraccas issued a decree prohibiting the slave-trade; and, in confirmation of this decree, an article was inserted in the Federal Constitution of Venezuela, promulgated on the 21st of December, 1811, of which the following is a copy:—"The vile traffic in slaves, prohibited by the decree of the Supreme Junta of Caraccas, on the 14th of August, 1810, is hereby solemnly and constitutionally abolished throughout the territory of the Union, it being unlawful in any manner to import slaves of any kind, for the purposes of mercantile speculation."

Upon the union of Venezuela with New Grenada, in 1821, under the name of the Republic of Columbia, a law, bearing date the 19th July of that year, founded upon a recommendation of the Venezuela Congress, was enacted for the abolition of the slave-trade of Columbia, and for the gradual extinction of slavery throughout the republic.

Upon the separation of Venezuela from Columbia, in 1830, a law was issued under date of the 2nd of October that year, in substitution of the law passed by that republic in 1821.

By the law of 1821, all children born of female slaves in the republic of Columbia subsequently to the 19th July of that year, are FREE. The words of the law are as follows:—"The children of female slaves born subsequent to the 19th July, 1821, are free."

From that time the abolition of slavery seems to have been considered as a fundamental principle of the republic. It should be observed, however, in reference to the children declared free by the law of 1821, that they are required to labour for the owners of their mothers until the age of eighteen, as an indemnification for the expenses of their training and maintenance; but, by the law of 1830, the period of service is extended, in the case of all children born of slave mothers after the 2nd October of that year, until they arrive at the age of twenty-one, when they enter upon the full possession of their rights.

The estimated amount of slaves in Venezuela in 1832 was 46,793, of whom 22,139 were males, and 24,654 females; the free people of all colours, 713,809. According to the census of 1837, the number of slaves was 37,689, composed of 17,502 males, and 20,187 females; the free people of all colours, 838,809. The estimated number of slaves, in 1843, was 28,585, of whom 12,865 were males, and 15,727 females; the free people of all colours, 1,088,809.

From the comparison of these figures, which are given on the authority of the British consul residing at Caraccas, for the information of her Ma-

jest's Government, it results that slavery in Venezuela is rapidly approaching its term. No slave has been born in the republic since the year 1821; and no slaves have been imported from Africa, it is affirmed on high authority, since the year 1810, when Bolivar gave liberty to the numerous slaves on his estates.

By the laws of Venezuela it is provided that the republic shall purchase annually at least twenty of the existing slaves, out of funds created expressly for that purpose; that the slaves shall have the right of self-redemption, at a price fixed by the legal tariff for those of the same age and sex, either out of funds saved by their industry, or by advances made on their behalf by other persons; that, in case of ill-treatment by their masters, they acquire the right of selling themselves, at the legal price, to any willing to purchase them; and that the children born of female slaves may be relieved from all obligation of service to their masters on payment of one-half the price for a slave of the same age and sex, as determined by the Spanish tariff.

In criminal cases the slave is protected by law equally with free-men, and their evidence is taken in all cases in the courts of law, except for or against their masters. They are said to be well fed and treated, to be allowed two suits of coarse clothing annually, and to be allowed Sundays and twelve feast-days in the year to themselves. In reference to work, it is said, that it is performed usually by task, which does not exceed in amount two-thirds of that commonly performed by a free labourer.

By the treaty between Great Britain and Venezuela, signed at Caracas the 15th March, 1839, the republic binds itself to preserve in force the provisions of the law of the 18th of February, 1825, which declares all Venezuelans found trafficking in African slaves guilty of piracy, and punishable with death; and all slaves introduced in violation of the law *ipso facto* free.

It is much to be regretted that Venezuela allows the remnants of the slave-system still to desecrate her otherwise free institutions; and that advantage is taken of the fact to decry the measure of the last session, which was designed to exclude slave-grown sugar from the British markets. How far the small quantity of that article which has recently been introduced from Venezuela into the port of Liverpool can be shown to be slave-grown, it is, perhaps, impossible to say; but, supposing it were slave-grown, which cannot be proved, it should be remembered that the laws of that republic have provided for the extinction of slavery, and that the time cannot be far distant when none but free-men shall be found within its borders.

NOTE.—Those who may wish to pursue the subject further, will do well to consult the *Slave-trade Papers, Class D*, 1839, p. 39; *Idem, Class D*, 1840, p. 36; and *Idem, Class C*, 1843, pp. 302—305.

THE LETTER OF MARSHAL BUGEAUD.

Algiers, 13 November, 1844.

(From our Correspondent.)

THE letter of Marshal Bugeaud is very inconsistent with the spirit of the paragraph which I sent you last post, extracted from an article of M. Subtil on the African city of *Gadames*. We must, however, have patience. The Marshal is on the eve of leaving Algiers, and it is probable he will not return. Another governor may take another view of the subject. Nevertheless, we must not let the letter of the Marshal pass, especially as it has excited a great deal of attention in France. The *Algerie*, a French paper, seems to rejoice in its production, as it is a sort of defiance of all abolitionists whatsoever, and particularly those of England. The marshal, indeed, has the reputation of being very blunt and very frank. It is, perhaps, better to have to deal with such a person than a polished, cautious, pro-slaverist, it being easier to understand him and grapple with him.

I shall take up the letter *seriatim*. The Marshal, like nearly all anti-abolitionists, begins with giving in his adhesions to anti-slavery doctrines. "It is," says the Marshal, "only a question of time and opportunity:—*Nous ne differons vous et moi que sur l'opportunité du moment.*" This is something gained. It is better than preaching pro-slavery doctrines. But this covers the demon *policy*—that policy which is the constant plea for the most inhuman acts of which mankind render themselves guilty before a just and incensed Creator.

This policy, as to the present subject, is thus explained by the Governor General of these possessions. "Our rule," says the Marshal, "is not well established. Besides, our system of administration is very different from that of France. It is very simple; we have adopted it from the Turks and Abd el Kader. But this simplicity, which costs us so little, is quite inefficacious for the extinction of the traffic of slavery. If, therefore, we would not sacrifice the interests of France, our country, we must for the present leave the slavery question where it is, and make the best of a bad state of things." This is the argument of the Marshal. It simply means "Charity begins at home." The Marshal cannot be philanthropic at the expense of Frenchmen. We merely reply to this part of the Marshal's letter, that he exaggerates the difficulties of maintaining a cordon on the frontier against the importation of slaves into Algeria. The Marshal's government has established a line of telegraphs, and it is vaunted that by this adoption of the telegraphic system in Africa not a single criminal can escape. What a pity it is that this telegraph cannot be worked in one of the noblest works of humanity—the extinction of the detestable traffic in human beings! But so it is: the wickedness of man must have its course; and the Marshal will offer no compensation for the thousand razzias and butcheries of human beings inflicted upon Algeria by the French troops—no, none. An idea suggests itself, how does the Bey of Tunis maintain this cordon? He finds no difficulties; there has been no *emeute* on account of the abolition of slavery amongst the Moors or Arabs of that country.

The Marshal then states that, in spite of all the efforts of two great nations like France and England, the traffic in slaves has increased. This I do not believe; but I add also, that, if there be still a very active traffic carried on in slaves, it is because the great powers of Europe and America have never been sincere and united in their efforts. France, especially, has refused her adhesion to the great powers of Europe for the extinction of slavery. However, it would appear the pro-slavery party are now determined to make use of a circumstance of their own creating for the continuance of slavery for ever. Their reasoning is like the following:—"We won't co-operate for the extinction of the

slave-trade. This will make the slave-trade remain stationary, perhaps increase it. We will then use this circumstance of the stationary state, or increase, of the slave-trade, as an argument why we should abandon all ideas of co-operating for the abolition of slavery." This is the argument of Marshal Bugeaud and all the pro-slavery party. As to the co-operation of the great powers, has not John Quincy Adams, in his solemn manifesto, declared that the United States' government have lately done all in their power for the maintenance and the continual duration of slavery?

The Marshal, however, pushes his objections further. He thinks that, if France were to liberate the Negroes of Algeria, the Arabs would revolt from the French authority. Happily, we have before us the memorial of another Frenchman, which just comes in time to refute this statement. M. Subtil says, in his memorial on the city of *Gadames*—a city situate on the borders of the desert between Tunis and Tripoli, and under the nominal protection of the Porte—which memorial is published in the "*Revue de l'Orient*" of last month—that the Arabs are growing quite indifferent to the possession of Negro slaves, and that now but few slaves arrive from the interior by the large caravans for the markets of Northern Africa. This is a point-blank counter-statement to what the Marshal says of the infinite desire which the Arabs have for slaves. Now M. Subtil should be the better judge, as he has lived for many years, up to a very recent date, amongst the Arabs.

The Marshal then proceeds to the hackneyed arguments in support of slavery in Northern Africa—that the Koran permits slavery, that the slaves are well treated by the Moors and Arabs, and that they are sometimes liberated. What a farce is all this? The Koran, in the first place, permits slavery, but it always encourages the abolition of slavery as a pious work, and this abolition in every manner and to any extent. Then as to the kind treatment of the slaves by the Arabs (*semi-barbarians*!) this is a matter of caprice. The only thing you can say is, the tender mercies of the Arabs and Moors of Northern Africa are more tolerable than the Christian sugar-planters of Cuba, of the cotton-planters of the Southern States of the American Union. Did I not inform you of a negress slave, who was a few months ago tied up by the heels, the head downwards, and beaten by her master until senseless? Marshal Bugeaud, however, pretends that cases of cruelty are never heard of in Algeria! So have always pretended the pro-slaverists. The case of this negress slave at Onan has, however, been reported to the French government at Paris.

The Marshal then contradicts the assertion of the African Institute—that there were markets for slaves at Algiers, Oran, and Bona. I believe the Institute never meant to say that there were. All that the Institute meant was, that there were slaves sold in these three cities of the coast, in which the Marshal admits the sales were conducted, though privately. Now the Marshal's admission is worth something, as many Frenchmen in Algiers, with whom I have conversed on the subject, have had the audacity to deny the existence of these sales, and some have gone so far (ashamed of the thing) as to declare that there were no slaves at all in Algeria.

But the most important part of the Marshal's letter is the *postscript*, which, it appears, though the Marshal talks about forgetfulness, is the *soul and essence of the matter*. This postscript I give you entire:—"I had forgotten one argument. We desire to open commercial relations with the interior of Africa. This project, is it practicable if we deprive those distant countries of a branch of their commerce?" The Marshal, then, will establish commercial relations with the interior of Africa by the revivifying of the slave-trade between the coast and the interior! Can anything be conceived more shocking and diabolical? This is to be the result of French civilization of Africa—the end of all the sacrifices of blood and treasure by France in attempting to colonise this country, and the recompense to the natives for the miseries which they have suffered from French occupation? I am, however, sure that the French people will not consent to this; and the letter of Marshal Bugeaud will be treated as it deserves to be—as a miserable failure to prop up a falling cause. After Subtil has told us such good news of the decline of this traffic, and even predicted its near extinction, it is too bad to be told by a French marshal, let him be ever so celebrated in war or wisdom, that this traffic is not to be allowed to die a miserable death as it deserves, execrated by all humane men of every nation under heaven; but that it is to be revived for the benefit of Marshal Bugeaud's schemes of opening commercial communications with the interior of Africa. Besides, this would be very unjust towards the Bey of Tunis, a friendly and neighbouring power. To obtain his object of abolition his Highness must have made many sacrifices, and it is most unjust that a new power, a European and a Christian power, should occasion this generous and enlightened Mussulman prince any additional sacrifice; and that the French should, by encouraging the traffic in slaves, draw off the caravans of the interior from the markets of Tunis, where they now go, not to sell slaves, but to purchase goods for the commerce of Central Africa. This matter ought to form the basis of a protest from our Government: it is an exceptional case. France ought not to be allowed to retain possession of Algeria, if such possession brings, as its immediate consequence, the increase of the slave-trade in Northern Africa.

Home Intelligence.

THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

THE Committee of the Glasgow Emancipation Society having kept in view the proceedings of the Commission of the Free Church in relation to the American Deputation, and finding reason to be dissatisfied with their decision, convened a public meeting of the Society in the City Hall, on the 18th of November, Councillor Turner in the chair. At this meeting the Committee presented an interim report detailing their proceedings in the case; after which it was addressed by the Rev. Dr. Ritchie, the Rev. G. S. Ingram, Mr. Henry C. Wright, of the United States, the Rev. Drs. Bates and Willis, and the Rev. G. Jeffrey. We are sorry that we have not room for even an abstract of the speeches, some of which were highly animating and impressive. The resolutions adopted were as follows:—

I. That this Society, from its character and objects, is deeply interested

in whatever may affect the progress of the abolition of slavery in the United States of America; where, although the people of this country possess no direct means of influencing the existing state of society, we yet deem it our solemn and bounden duty to embrace every lawful opportunity that may favourably affect public opinion in behalf of Emancipation.

That, with this view, this Society lately took the liberty of remonstrating, in a friendly manner, with the Free Church of Scotland, as did also the Abolitionists of America, on the impropriety and impolicy of knowingly accepting contributions from acknowledged slaveholders, to promote the extension of the Gospel in Scotland.

That this Society is deeply grieved at the indifference with which this important subject appears to be regarded by the Free Church, and fears that that religious body is not sufficiently impressed with the pernicious effects which will undoubtedly result to the anti-slavery cause, from the mere presumption in the United States, that such a large and influential section of the Christian Church in this country is favourable to slavery, from the fact of their receiving the aforesaid contributions from American slaveholders.

That, while this Society desires to cherish the utmost good feeling towards the Free Church, and has no wish to usurp any control or authority over them or any other Church in this matter; nor ever conceived that that, or any other Christian community could, in any degree, be amenable—as is implied in the Moderator's letter of the 1st October last—to this, or any philanthropic society, any more than Judge O'Neal could be supposed to be, for the cruel and despotic sentence passed upon John L. Brown, which this Society, in common with the Free Presbytery of Glasgow, and other bodies remonstrated against; yet we would remind the Free Church, or any other that may receive and retain similar contributions, that public opinion is a bar at which, whether we will or not, they and we will be held amenable in regard to such matters; and that the condition of slavery in America, and its abolition in that country, where nearly three millions of our fellow-men are subjected to its degrading yoke, is a great public question of deep interest to the people of Great Britain and the United States, the progress of which will not be permitted to be marred by any body of Christian professors throwing themselves in the way, through accepting the contributions of slaveholders for the propagation of the Gospel.

This Society, therefore, renews its protest against the reception, by the Free Church of Scotland, or any other Evangelical Church, of the contributions of slaveholders; and earnestly implores the Free Church, in a spirit of candour and faithfulness, to return to the donors their blood-stained offerings.

II. That this Society, having observed with unmingled sorrow the deliverance of the Commission of the Free Church Assembly, in regard to holding fellowship with slave-holding Churches and ministers, would deem it matter of the deepest regret should that deliverance be approved and acted on by the ministers of that Church in general, because of its obvious injury to the great cause of the abolition of slavery in the United States, and, it may be, in other slaveholding countries; inasmuch as from that circumstance, arguments, whether right or wrong, would be advanced in favour of slavery, and pro-slavery or slaveholding ministers coming to this country from America, depending on the countenance of the Free Church ministers, would find their way into their pulpits, if not also into those of other denominations; whereby the monstrous system of American slavery, instead of being branded with universal condemnation, would be made to appear in its best colours, so as to render it, if not unobjectionable, at any rate less offensive to the Christian feelings of the British public.

That, entertaining these views, this Society resolves to memorialise the Free Church, and the ministers and Churches of all the other denominations of Christians, to raise their united voices in remonstrance with the Churches of America on this great question of humanity and religion; to record their solemn disapprobation of holding fellowship with slaveholding Churches or pro-slavery ministers, and to exclude all such from their pulpits.

IN THE PRESBYTERY OF GLASGOW, on the 4th instant, the Rev. Dr. Willis brought forward the subject of religious fellowship with slave-holders; and, after some discussion, the following motion was carried unanimously:—"That this Presbytery do overture the General Assembly to take into serious consideration, the question of ecclesiastical fellowship with those churches in America, which are known, or shall be found to encourage slavery; and that due care be taken to instruct deputations (if any) sent to visit the pro-slavery States to avoid such communication with avowed defenders of these practices as may commit our church to any participation in other men's sins."

Foreign Intelligence.

UNITED STATES.—POLICY OF THE WHIGS TOWARDS TEXAS.—At a meeting held subsequently to the election of Mr. Polk, Mr. Webster used the following language:—"In the correspondence with regard to the admission of Texas, that project was advocated mainly in order to support what were called the peculiar institutions of this country. It was almost too much to read the comments of Europe upon this ground of argument. An honest man could hardly listen to the proposition that, when morals, religion, civilization, everything respected, were opposed to the maintenance of slavery, America should come forward and declare it necessary to the support of her institutions. This was a question that could not be permanently decided against us to-day or to-morrow. If we could not avert it now by choice of President or Vice-President, we must do it by choice of members of Congress, and by sending our young, strong, and active men, to oppose the admission of Texas, and the perpetuation of slavery. He should shrink from no service to oppose it wherever and whenever he might."

POOR TORREY.—A benevolent gentleman, who did much for Torrey's comfort in gaol, and who saw him only a few days before his unlucky attempt to escape, tells us that in his opinion, Torrey cannot live a fortnight in such weather, confined and ironed in a dungeon, and with such a fever upon him. They are murdering him.—*Boston Chronicle*.

MORE VICTIMS.—A Mr. Fairbank and his wife are in gaol in Kentucky, charged with the crime of aiding their fellow-creatures to obtain liberty.

TEXAS AND THE SLAVE-MARKET.—Messrs. J. H. Bondurant and Co., slave merchants at Mobile, inform those who have men, women, and children for sale, that the slave-market will be depressed until Texas is admitted into the Union, after which event they confidently expect to be able to pay liberal prices for negroes.—*Alb. Jour.*

TEXAS.—The following is an extract of a letter from Galveston, dated Oct. 1, received in the city:—"An invasion is expected. Galveston is entirely without defence; and Texas has not a single vessel that can put to sea against the enemy."

Mr. Ashbel Smith, the Texan *chargé d'affaires*, had an interview with the Earl of Aberdeen last week, immediately after which he set out for Galveston.

SPAIN.—"I have reason to believe that the British Minister has received renewed assurances of the intention of the Government to pass a law for the suppression of the slave-trade, and that without much delay. The late proclamation of O'Donnell in Cuba, ordering the confiscation of slaves would seem to show that there is some serious intention of fulfilling the promises lately made to our Government. I am also certain that the energy and decision manifested by Mr. Bulwer on this important subject will produce a good effect."—*Correspondent of the Times*.

PORTUGAL.—A motion was made in the Chamber of Deputies on the 29th inst., by Senhor Gaviao, for copies of all instructions given to the Governors of Angola and Mozambique, and the commanders of vessels on these stations. The *Revolution*, in reference to this subject, says, that documentary evidence has been furnished to its editor from Angola, showing that certain authorities of that province were engaged in the slave-trade with entire impunity, but that the naval officers commanding on that station had resisted all efforts to corrupt them, though great exertions had been made for that purpose; and from a recent motion of the Viscount de Sa, calling for a Government inquiry into the conduct of the governors of these African possessions, it was evident that grave suspicions of connivance were entertained."—*Correspondent of Morning Chronicle*.

PRUSSIA.—COLONIZATION.—Berlin, Nov. 25th.—To the four or five places of colonization hitherto proposed, (Texas, the Mississippi, St. Thomas, Brazil, and the Mosquito shore,) another is now added, situate on the west coast of Africa, which causes much attention, because the great Elector of Brandenburg had acquired possession of a spot on that coast. This is Cape Mount, half way between Sierra Leone and the North American negro colony, Liberia, bounded to the south and east by Little Cape Mount, and to the north-west by the river Sugari. This spot was formerly ceded, on the 23rd of February, 1841, to the present proprietors, George Clavering Redman and Theodore Canot, under the protection and assistance of the British naval force, in order to abolish the slave-trade by means of a lawful commerce. The owners have already erected dwelling-houses and other buildings, and built two ships. Mr. Redman is now in Berlin, and is endeavouring to gain friends for the establishment of a colony. He particularly invites attention to the ample revenue derivable from the rich soil, and from commerce; and likewise to the gold mines, which might be worked to advantage, no mining operations ever having been carried on in that country.—*Hamburg paper*.

Miscellanea.

SLAVE-TRADE.—Official advices from Loanda announce that, on the 27th of August last, a launch from the naval station there seized three boats, on the beach to the south of Corimba, laden with slaving provisions; and, on the 8th of September, another cruising launch, after a short engagement with the men belonging to a Brazilian slaver, the brig *Jupiter*, seized six boats, three of them with slaves on board, to the number of ninety-three. About six times that number of slaves were carried off into the woods; but the attempt to ship them was frustrated, and the barracoons on shore were destroyed.—*Times*.

DONATIONS AND SUBSCRIPTIONS.

THE following contributions have been received since our last, and are hereby thankfully acknowledged:—

	Donations.	Subs.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Leominster—Newman, George	—	2 0 0
Pritchard, John	—	2 0 0
Southall, E. P.	—	2 0 0
Southall, Samuel	—	2 0 0
Clifton—Guillebaud, Rev. P.	5 0 0	1 1 0
Derby—Evans, William, M.P.	100 0 0	—
Liverpool—Cropper, John	25 0 0	—
Cropper, Edward	25 0 0	—
Norwich—Birkbeck, Henry	20 0 0	—
Borough—Sterry, T.	—	0 10 0
Amwell—Squire, J. H.	—	1 0 0
Worcester—Brewin, Edward	—	1 0 0
Camborne—Budge, John	—	2 2 0
Uxbridge—Hull, Samuel	10 0 0	—
Tottenham—Forster, Josiah	—	3 3 0
London—Moxhay, Edward	5 5 0	—
Barclay, J. G.	—	1 1 0
Truro—Tweedy, William	1 0 0	—

Printed by WILLIAM TYLER, of 25, Duncan-terrace, Islington, in the county of Middlesex, printer, and CHARLES REED, of Cambridge-heath, Hackney, in the said county of Middlesex, printer, at their printing-office, No. 5, Bolt-court, Fleet-street, in the parish of St. Dunstan-in-the-West in the city of London; and published by LANCELOT WILD, of No. 13, Catherine-street, in the parish of St. Mary-le-Strand, in the county of Middlesex, publisher, at 13, Catherine-street, Strand, as aforesaid. Wednesday, December 11, 1844.